

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

March 27, 2001 LB 523

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Now, Nebraska is not one of the three states named on that list.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: No, that's true.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So it would not be counted toward validating this compact if only two other states on that list had agreed.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: That's right. The compact can go on without us, that's...there's no question about it, and we would have to wait a couple years before we could try again probably.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And Congress would have to authorize this or ratify it. Otherwise, all the things done by those individual states have no legal significance.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: That is true.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay. Now I want to proceed. Oh, I need to talk about why I'm against this amendment. There are legal type issues involved in this bill which some of the senators don't deal with on a regular basis, and I understand that. But simply because it's offered as a committee amendment does not mean it ought to be adopted. We need to look at the policy behind these punishments and see if they are justified by the types of violations we're talking about, but we don't know what those violations are because no rules or regulations have been adopted yet.

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So we ought to be discussing the nature of this compact, the types of rules or regulations that might have to be put in place to carry it out, and to see if there is a distinction between maybe a significant substantive rule and just some routine procedural rule. But if you violate a procedural rule or a substantive rule, then the punishments don't take cognizance of the fact that there are differing levels of seriousness. Even when we say that there are ranges of punishments for an offense, we still give different names to offenses. Some felonies will have a lesser minimum than the